

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 are pending, in which claims 3, 5, 12, and 14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1 and 4 are currently amended, and no claims are withdrawn from consideration or newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed June 15, 2010 objected to claims 1 and 4, rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (US 2002/0105911) in view of *Bahadiroglu et al.* (US 2002/0186660), *Hilliker* (US 2002/0100422), and *Ikami* (US 2002/0026247).

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended in accordance with the suggestions on page 3 of the Final Office Action. Accordingly, the objection to claims 1 and 4 has been overcome.

As to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9, the Examiner asserts (Office Action, page 4-5) that it is unclear whether applicant intended to invoke 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph, for the claim element “selector,” since the phrase “means for” or “step for” has not been used and no specific structure is recited to perform the function of the element. According to the Office Action, the Examiner has assumed that the sixth paragraph has been invoked and states that there is insufficient disclosure of structure to perform the function recited in the claim.

However, “selector” is a term of art, defined in Newton’s Telecom Dictionary as “The identifier (octet string) used by an OSI entity to distinguish among multiple SAPs at which it provides services to the layer above.” “Selector” is not merely a function, but rather is a specific element. Therefore, the Examiner has inappropriately invoked the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Furthermore, the recitation of a selector in the specification is specific and

sufficient disclosure for the claimed selector. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 over *Pruthi*, *Bahadiroglu*, *Hilliker*, and *Ikami*, the Office Action asserts (page 7) that *Hilliker* discloses that “the sequence of messages read in by the selector is dependent upon a selection with which a specific point of the course of the first characteristic feature is selectable in the second region.” However, *Hilliker* does not teach or suggest any points in the course of the first characteristic feature which is displayed in the second region (i.e., in the plot of attenuation versus frequency) being selectable in the second region. No points are indicated as being selectable. The only points that might be considered selected are the markers, but the markers on the plot are not selectable. Instead all of the markers and the corresponding information are displayed in a third region. No selection takes place.

The Office Action (pages 8-9) turns to *Ikami* for “displaying a selectable marking produced automatically by the selector in the second region based on a predefined additional item of information, upon selection of the marking, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device.” However, *Ikami* does not read in a sequence of temporally successive messages, nor does *Ikami* display a sequence of temporally successive messages in a first region of a display. *Ikami* discloses a data structure for data stored in a database. The data is not disclosed as being temporally successive messages, but rather represents values of a function for different values of  $x$  and  $y$ . The first display window displays a graph of  $f_i$  versus  $y$  for each value of  $x$ . *Ikami* displays a marker pointing to a particular value of  $y$  in the first window, and the second window displays a graph of  $f_i$  versus  $x$  for that particular value of  $y$ . The marker is not selectable, but is automatically

selected and the corresponding information displayed. Further, the marking is not based on an additional item of information stored during storage of the messages, as *Ikami* does not disclose messages nor characteristic features of messages. In addition, to the extent that the marking is selected, such selection does not result in a sequence of messages corresponding to the selected marking being read in from storage. Instead, a portion of data displayed in the first display window is displayed a different way in a second window superimposed on the first window. At best, *Ikami* discloses selection of a portion of data displayed in a first area to display in a second area similar to *Pruthi*. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references still fails to teach or suggest a selectable marking in the display of a first characteristic feature in a second window, and selection of the marking resulting in the reading in from storage of a sequence of messages corresponding to the marking. Therefore, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established, and the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 cannot be sustained.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

August 18, 2010  
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/  
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 44658

Anita Pellman Gross  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 63325

918 Prince Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Tel. (703) 519-9952  
Fax (703) 519-9958